15

AN

ANSWER,

TO A

PAMPHLET

ENTITLED, THE

Speech of the Earl of Clare,

ON THE SUBJECT OF

A LEGISLATIVE UNION,

BETWEEN

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

By HENRY GRATTAN, Esq.

DUBLIN:
PRINTED FOR J. MOORE, NO. 45, COLLEGE-GREEN.
1800.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE

PRINTER.

I HAVE ſeen a pamphlet, purporting to be written on the Union, and publiſhed in the name of the Earl of Clare. The ſpeech of the Noble Earl, delivered in the Houſe of Lords, I have nothing to ſay to, but a publication is not a ſpeech, and though it be the work of a member of Parliament, has no privilege. Whether his Lordſhip be the author, I have no authority, ſave the aſſumption of the publication, to affirm; but the pamphlet contains againſt ſeveral, with whom I have acted, charges, the moſt direct, and againſt myſelf, for the laſt 20 years, charges the leaſt qualified and inſinuations, the moſt deep. What is yet worſe it tends to lower

the

the character of the Country, and to tarnish the brightest passages of her history, as well as the memories of the persons concerned in those transactions. Matter so various and comprehensive, could not be regularly discussed in any debate that has come or is likely to come before the House of Commons: in the interval of business, I therefore resort to the only method of defence, the Press.

H. GRATTAN.

Mr. Grattan will take no notice of any Answer, except one coming from the Author of the Pamphlet.

AN

ANSWER,

&c. &c.

OF the work which it is propoſed to anſwer nearly one third is the common place of Iriſh Hiſtory: much of abridgment, much of miſrepreſentation, no new diſcovery, no new remark; the termini or landmarks of hiſtoric knowledge, remain precifely as they were, in their old ſober ſtation. What was long known before by many men, by many women, and by many children, the compendium of the ſtudies of your childhood, this pamphlet reports to you, for the amuſement of your age, without any other novelty, ſave that of miſrepreſentation. The idea is to make your hiſtory a calumny againſt your anceſtors in order to diſfranchiſe your poſterity: the execution is without the temper of a commentator or the knowledge of an hiſtorian.

We will begin with this performance, at the Iriſh parliament of James 1ſt. The author is now within 187 years of his

his ſubject. Ireland, ſays he, had no parliamentary conſtitution 'till that time. Here his pages only deſerve attention, in order to vindicate the lineage of our liberties againſt ſlander. This ſtatement is a traduction of the inheritance of the realm, a calumny againſt her antiquities and a falſification of her title. Lord Coke, the judges of England, the records of Ireland, the *modus tenendi parliamentum*, the ſtatute-book, the extent of acts of Parliament before the reign of James throughout the realm, and the act of annexation among others, anſwer him: from all thoſe you find that Ireland had a Parliament from the beginning, and that the legiſlature was not of the Pale, but of the nation. *

The boldneſs of this aſſertion is rendered the more remarkable by the diſtinguiſhed feebleneſs of its reaſoning. The pamphlet attempts to prove that to be true in argument which is falſe in fact, and its argument is, that James 1ſt generalized Iriſh repreſentation, by forty private boroughs, that is, that he rendered repreſentation general, by making it particular. It teaches you to think, that it was James inſtead of Eliz. who created the 17 Counties, and not the 40 boroughs, by him erected to counteract that county repreſentation, in order to pack a Parliament; a traffic which this work ſeems diſpoſed to admire. It conceives that the legiſlature was not general, becauſe the reſepreſentation was not ſo; it ſhould have ſaid, that the legiſlature being general, the repreſentation ought to be ſo. It diſcovers two ideas of a new and extraordinary nature on this ſubject that Parliament—is confined by the bounds of repreſentation, and that national repreſentation is extended by

* See the ſpeech of the late ſecretary of State, Mr. Hutchinſon, on the ſubject of parliamentary reform, in the parliamentary debates of 93. It is a complete anſwer to the pamphlet on this part of the ſubject. See extract from it at the end.

by the creation of private boroughs: and for this paradoxical idea of Parliament, and this paradoxical idea of repreſentation, it offers you nothing like extent of erudition, or force of imagination: the art of modern war ſays the pamphlet, is to traduce the houſe of Stewart; the art of modern court loyalty, it might have added, is to praiſe the principle of the Stewart and to plant it in the Houſe of Hanover.

The pamphlet now comes to its own times, and it is to be remarked, that as it dwelt on the paſt with all the fury and prejudices of the preſent time, ſo it expatiates on the preſent, with as much error and mistake, as if it were treating of the remoteſt antiquity. It ſtates the adjuſtment of 82, to be deſcribed by its author as follows: "that it emanated "from the armed convention aſſembled at Dungannon, was "approved at county meetings of the people, armed and "unarmed, and was ſanctioned and regiſtered by the Iriſh "Parliament:" No ſuch thing, nor any thing like it, did its author ſay, nor ſuggeſt, nor hint; and this ſtatement of the pamphlet is not miſrepreſentation, nor miſinterpretation, but palpable invention, did not the pamphlet aſſume the name of a judicial character, I would ſay, downright fabrication; I reſpect and admire the meeting at Dungannon, but the ſubjects of 82 did not emanate from thence; two years before were they diſcuſſed in Parliament, they were diſcuſſed on the 19th of April, 1780, on a motion made by myſelf, and in the courſe of that ſeſſion, and of the next ſeſſion, repeatedly and fully; they were adopted by different counties, and various diſcriptions of men, and they finally paſſed the Parliament. Such is the hiſtory; the pamphlet falſifies the hiſtory, to blemiſh a great tranſaction, and attributes that falſification to me in order to blemiſh an individual.

We

We follow the work where it will be perhaps more fortunate. It objects on the queſtion of the claim of right to the declarations of the Volunteers; their character now, it ſeems, it profeſſes to admire; their conduct however (this was the moſt leading part of the conduct, of the old Volunteers,) it condemns; the inconſiſtency of ſetting up a character, and putting down a conduct, is glaring, but in a work pregnant with every thing which is exceptionable, hardly deſerves notice. But will any man ſeriouſly ſay, that thoſe bodies ſhould not have come forward at that time with reſolutions in favour of a claim of right? does any man mean to affirm that we could have eſtabliſhed that claim without them? If ſo, he is a miſtater of the truth. Does any man mean to ſay, that the claim did not deſerve to be eſtabliſhed? if ſo, he is a ſlave; and in neither caſe does he deſerve an anſwer. To have countenanced reſolutions eſſential to the eſtabliſhment of your conſtitution, and to have oppoſed any further interference, when that conſtitution was eſtabliſhed, was the duty and the pride of them by whom the buſineſs of 82 was conducted. By the firſt ſtep they procured the conſtitution; by the ſecond, they ſaved the government; and in both they deſerved well of their country, and are placed far above the reach of the author of this little performance, its little cenſure or its little praiſe. We thought that at that time, as in the period of *magna charta*, armed men might make declarations to recover liberty, and having recovered it, we thought they ſecured their glory as well as their freedom, by retiring to cultivate the bleſſings of peace.

The pamphlet has further objections; it condemns the expedition with which the claim of right was eſtabliſhed, it calls for diſcuſſion, and delay—to do what? to debate whether the Engliſh Parliament had a right to make laws for Ireland

Ireland; whether the privy councils in both countries ſhould alter your bills, or whether the mutiny bill ſhould be perpetual? why, for the two preceding years, theſe ſubjects had been, and little other than theſe ſubjects had been, debated. The pamphlet has proved to you, however, the neceſſity of expedition, by its argument for delay; for it explains to you, that we were to delay the queſtion, in order to ſell it, that is, in order to diminiſh, clog, and condition your claim of right: you were to delay, the pamphlet explains, in order to preſerve to the Parliament of England, over this country, a ſhare of legiſlative power, and the pamphlet adminiſters additional arguments againſt its project of delay, by ſhewing you, that the viceroy of that time was intriguing againſt your favourite meaſures, and it gives you ſtill further arguments againſt delay, by ſuggeſting that there were certain gentlemen at that time, who would not with their lives have ſupported their liberties; it might have added, nor with their votes: perfectly well do we underſtand the author; and this pamphlet might have added, with peculiar authority, that there were certain young gentlemen at that time, ready to barter honour for office, and liberty for chains. It was therefore, we did not liſten to the idea of delay; we did not chuſe to ſet up the inheritance of the people of Ireland to auction; we were applied to for delay, and we refuſed it; we thought the 16th of April was the day of the Iriſh Nation, and we were determined not to ſleep, until laying our heads on the pillow, we could ſay, this day Ireland has obtained a victory.

Seeing then, that the conſtitution was eſtabliſhed without delay, or barter, or auction, the pamphlet does not deſpair, it has a cure, viz. corruption; it does not indeed ſet forth corruption in words, but it does amply and broadly in idea.

The expreſſions are theſe: "the only ſecurity for national "concurrence is a permanent and commanding influence of "the Engliſh executive, or rather Engliſh cabinet in the "councils of Ireland." By councils of Ireland it means, and profeſſes to mean, nothing leſs than the Parliament, ſee page 45. Here is the neceſſary ſubſtitute, it ſeems, for the Britiſh Parliament—here is the half million—here is the dependency of the Iriſh Parliament avowed as a principle; here breaks out of the taint and ſore of that unfortunate ſyſtem, whoſe rankneſs the pamphlet ſeems to have deeply inhaled, and with whoſe political incenſe it now deigns to regale our noſtrils and its own; here is acknowledged the truth of the complaint of the oppoſition, namely, that the Britiſh miniſter ſome years after the ſettlement of 1782, wiſhed, through his agents here, to filch back our Conſtitution of 1782, ſo honourably and nobly obtained, and to reſume by fraud what had been obtained by treaty. In vain ſhall a miniſter come forth in ſounding words, ſuch as national concurrence or national connexion, and wrap himſelf up in the threadbare coat of zeal for empire, to ſtab his country to the heart; ſuch arguments are not to be anſwered but puniſhed, and when any man ſhall avow that he has no idea of governing in this country without rendering her Parliament by the means of influence, perfectly dependent on Great Britain, he avows not his profligacy only, but his incapacity alſo. Such a miniſter could not govern without corruption; he could not govern with it; he might indeed begin by attempts to pack a Parliament, but he will conclude by an attempt to aboliſh the legiſlature.

To return to the pamphlet. On the ſubject of the claim of right, the author ſeems to have three parental ideas; Firſt, That the Volunteers ſhould have made no declaration on the ſubject: Secondly, That the queſtion ſhould have been

left

left open to delay: and Thirdly, That the Britiſh cabinet ſhould ſucceed to the power of the Britiſh Parliament. By the firſt plan the conſtitution had been loſt, by the ſecond ſold, and by the third corrupted. We follow the pamphlet; it ſtates, that the adjuſtment of 1782 was deſcribed by the author of it as follows; then he introduces a deſcription which certainly was given by its author, but which was not a deſcription of the adjuſtment of the parliament of 1782, but of a parliament that ſat 187 years ago, and which was aſſembled by James I. in the year of our Lord 1613. Here again is that of which we have ſo often reaſon to complain in this work invention; true it is, that the boroughs created by James I. have had their effect on poſterity, and true it is, that thoſe boroughs continue to ſend members to parliament; ſo far the parliament of 1782 and of 1613 had a ſimilitude; but it is not true that the parliament of 1782 was a packed parliament like that of 1613; it is not true that the repreſentatives of the boroughs were either attornies clerks or the ſervants of the Caſtle as in 1613; nor is it true that the boroughs of 1782 reſembled thoſe created by James in 1613; and ſo far the two parliaments have no ſimilitude. Mr. Burke, ſpeaking to me of ſome country that had proſpered under a conſtitution conſiſting of three eſtates, but eſtates defectively formed, obſerved, "that it was of the nature of a conſtitution ſo formed as ours, however clumſy the conſtituent parts, when ſet together in action, ultimately to act well," ſo of that in queſtion. The boroughs, in a courſe of time, ceaſed to be under the influence of the king, and the conſtitution took root in the people; the crown became dependant for ſupply on the parliament, and the parliament by the octennial bill, became more intimately connected with the country; but however altered, depurated, and naturalized, this borough

ſyſtem

ſyſtem was an evil ſtill; in 1613 it was corruption—in 1800 it may be Union. The author of the pamphlet has not thought much on theſe ſubjects; 'tis aſtoniſhing how ſhallow is that little performance; it charges my deſcription of the parliament of 1613, as my deſcription of the parliament of 1782—that is, it makes a falſe inference, on its falſe inference, it makes a falſe compariſon, and the folly of its own inference and the fallaciouſneſs of its own compariſon, it attributes to another perſon. We follow the work. It affirms that the rivals of Mr. Flood had agreed in 1782 to ſupport a draft of a clandeſtine bill or treaty for imperial legiſlation which the pamphlet deſcribes, and adds that they ſacrificed to flimſy and corrupt popularity the peace of ages, &c. &c. Here are two aſſertions which I do affirm publicly, and in the moſt unqualified manner contain not one ſyllable, or tittle, or ſhadow of fact; the two aſſertions are wholely and moſt abſolutely deſtitute of foundation. The author of the pamphlet is called upon to ſupport them—he has acceſs to the Duke of Portland, to many of the cabinet of 82, in both countries, and to the official and the un-official agents of that time.

We have ſeen with what liberality the pamphlet aſſerts, we will now ſee with what œconomy it reaſons, and certainly its falter in fact muſt prejudice its authority in logic. It denies the ſettlement of 82 to have been final; the words of the ſettlement are as follows: "His Majeſty recommends it to take into conſideration the diſcontents and jealouſies prevailing in Ireland, in order to come to ſuch a *final* adjuſtment as may give mutual ſatisfaction to both kingdoms"—See his Meſſage to the reſpective Parliaments.—Parliament declares, "that no body of men whatever has any right

to

to make laws for Ireland, ſave only the King, Lords, and Commons thereof, that this is the birth-right of the people in which the eſſence of their liberty exiſts, and which we cannot ſurrender but with our lives"—See Addreſs of the Iriſh Commons 16th of April.—" His Majeſty has recommended the ſubject to his Parliaments of both kingdoms, truſting that their wiſdom will recommend meaſures as may terminate in a *final* adjuſtment"—See his Majeſty's anſwer.—" the Britiſh legiſlature has concurred in a reſolution to remove the cauſes of your diſcontents and jealouſies —the intention of the king, and willingneſs of the Britiſh Parliament come unaccompanied with *any ſtipulation or condition whatever.*"—See the Duke of Portland's ſpeech, 27th May.—" We conceive the reſolution for an unqualified, unconditional repeal of the 6th of Geo. I. to be a meaſure of juſtice and wiſdom, worthy of the Britiſh Parliament, and furniſhing a perpetual pledge of mutual amity—gratified in theſe particulars, *no conſtitutional queſtion will exiſt* between the two countries to interrupt their harmony"—See Iriſh Commons Anſwer 27th May.—" We rejoice that the name of Portland will be handed down as blended with a *full* and *perfect* eſtabliſhment of the conſtitution of Ireland"—See Commons Addreſs to his Excellency ſame day.—" His Majeſty aſſures his Commons of his affectionate acceptance of their acknowledgments of his Majeſty's and the Britiſh Parliament's attention to their repreſentation, and which they ſo juſtly conſider as furniſhing a *perpetual* pledge of mutual amity.—The declaration that *no conſtitutional queſtion* between the two nations will any longer exiſt that can interrupt their harmony, are very pleaſing to him"—See the King's Anſwer to Iriſh Addreſs of 27th May.—" We have ſeen this great national arrangement eſtabliſhed on a baſis which ſecures the tranquility of Ireland,

and

and unites the affections as well as the intereſts of both kingdoms"—See Commons Addreſs at the cloſe of the ſeſſion of 1782, "Convince the people of your ſeveral counties that the two kingdoms are now inſeparably one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of conſtitution and unity of intereſt—that every juſt cauſe of jealouſy is removed—that the two nations have pledged their faith, and their beſt ſecurity will be an adherence to that compact." See the ſecond ſpeech of the Lord Lieutenant at the cloſe of the ſeſſion and the adjuſtment.

Here is the record; the pamphlet propoſes to do away the force of record by the force of intrigue, and to ſet up a private correſpondence of the then Lord Lieutrnant againſt a public act. It produces an intrigue carried on with a view to clog the ſettlement, as ſufficient not to condition or interpret, but to over-hawl and overſet it; —it does not make the covenant concluſive on the inſincerity of the Viceroy, but the inſincerity of the Viceroy concluſive againſt the covenant—as if it were poſſible to conſtrue away the obligation of a deed of truſt by a private proteſt of the truſtee, or as if treaties between two nations were to be ſet aſide by the private letter of the Envoy. It goes further, it gives the private intrigue an extent which the intrigue itſelf never affected—it makes the correſpondence, containing a wiſh pending the adjuſtment and before its concluſion, to condition the Iriſh claim of right, tantamount to a public proteſt purporting to render it final in nothing.—The pamphlet ſtates, "That all the "parties looked on the adjuſtment of 1782 as leading "to a future political treaty."—Would any one believe, would any one conceive that the alledged author of that pamphlet ſhould be ignorant of the parties to that treaty, that he ſhould not know they were the King and the reſpective

ſpective Parliaments of the two countries; and that they were not, as he imagines, the individuals concerned in bringing that treaty to a concluſion?

But the author is ignorant of the ſentiments of thoſe individuals, as well as of the nature of the treaty. Thus Mr. Fox's ſentiments the pamphlet has miſrepreſented; *he* has declared that he wiſhed to make the beſt terms he could for Great Britain; but as Ireland would not condition her independence, he gave up the ſecond propoſition. It has miſtated the ſentiments of General Fitzpatrick; *he* declares that he was totally ignorant of the diſpatch of the Duke of Portland, and that he had at the very time aſſured the Iriſh Parliament, in the name of the Government which he then repreſented, that no farther meaſure was intended. He has miſtated Mr. Grattan's ſentiments, who publickly declares that every part of the aſſertion, as far as relates to him, is totally unfounded, without a ſhadow of colour or pretence; and calls on the author to ſupport his aſſertions. But I think I could quote *another* authority againſt this pamphlet; it is another pamphlet in the name of the ſame author publiſhed in 1798; which charges the people of Ireland and the oppoſition with a breach of faith in agitating certain political and commercial queſtions, after the kingdom had come to a final ſettlement with England, "A "ſettlement ſo complete and ſatisfactory as to render a "revival of political or conſtitutional controverſies utterly "impoſſible."

That pamphlet accordingly quotes the addreſs of 1782; declaring that all conſtitutional queſtions between the two countries ſhould ceaſe, and it extends the word *conſtitutional* to mean all *commercial* queſtions; and it extends the words *between the two nations* to mean queſtions *between the adminiſtation and the country*. This interpretation by the

the pamphlet of 1798, was as extravagant as the *opppoſite* interpretation by the pamphlet of 1800, in the name of the ſame author. The author is *there* made to differ from Mr. Pitt, and to ſay that the adjuſtment went to every thing; the author is *here* made to differ from himſelf, which is much leſs ſurpriſing, and to ſay that the adjuſtment extended to nothing. But here I muſt obſerve, that it is the argument only that is inconſiſtent, the ſentiment is perfectly uniform; it advanced covenant againſt national redreſs, and it now advances the will of the miniſter againſt covenant. Thus has this pamphlet on the ſubject of a national treaty, expatiated with extraordinary vehemence and confidence without knowing its purport, without knowing who were the parties, without knowing who ſhould be the parties, without knowing what were the ſentiments of the parties; in direct contradiction to the ſentiments of the principal agents, and to the ſpoken, written and printed opinion of the alledged author of the publication.

We follow the work; having denied a covenant which did exiſt, it fabricates a covenant which never had any exiſtence whatſoever; it aſſerts, page 47, that an alliance offenſive and defenſive, was formed by certain parties in both countries to play the independence of Ireland againſt their antagoniſts; 2dly, it affirms the principal object of that alliance to be, to guard againſt any ſettlement which might cut off the ſources of jealouſy and diſcontent between the two nations. I do aver in the moſt ſolemn, public and unqualified manner, that there is not the leaſt foundation, colour or pretence for either of thoſe aſſertions; and it is with great pain I feel myſelf forced to declare, that they are abſolutely and wholly deſtitute of any foundation, in fact or in truth; I refer to theſe facts—

Imme-

Immediately after the ſettlement of 1782, the Engliſh part of this pretended alliance went into oppoſition; the Iriſh part of this pretended alliance, till 1785, ſupported the government, and ſome of them, for years after; the Engliſh part of this pretended alliance oppoſed the French treaty; the Iriſh part ſupported it; ſome of the Engliſh part of this pretended alliance oppoſed the war, the Iriſh part ſupported it. Here then is a publick proof of the falſehood of the firſt poſition. We are furniſhed with further means of falſifying the ſecond.

The original propoſitions that paſſed the Iriſh Parliament in 1785, were that very ſettlement which the pamphlet deſcribes; that is, a ſettlement purporting to cut off the ſources of any remaining diſcontents and jealouſies between the two nations, and they had our warmeſt ſupport. So that the pamphlet has been ſo indiſcreet and ill adviſed as to advance and affirm two criminal charges poſitively and publickly, having, within the reach of its author's knowledge, certain facts, proving the falſehood of thoſe very charges, at the very time they were ſo injudiciouſly advanced.

The author is called upon to ſupport them; he muſt have acceſs to the Duke of Portland, to Mr. Pelham, and to many of thoſe who muſt have been parties in this pretended alliance. They are not our friends, they are his.

The work proceeds to ſtate, but not to ſtate fairly or fully, the propoſitions; and I cannot but again obſerve, that theſe frequent miſtakes in fact muſt create a prejudice againſt its logic. The beſt way of anſwering miſrepreſentation is by reciting the fact. The original ten propoſitions were formed with the conſent of the Britiſh cabinet; they were the work (at leaſt the firſt nine) as I

underſtand of a gentleman of this country, and they ſhewed in their ability and their compaſs; the hand of a maſter. A tenth was added, which ſtipulated for revenue to be given by this country to Great Britain; that 10th was altered in the cabinet in Ireland and divided into two reſolutions, the 1ſt declaring that no Iriſh revenue ſhould be given to England until all Iriſh charges were previouſly ſatisfied; the 2d, that the Iriſh revenue ſhould be raiſed to the Iriſh expences. The Iriſh miniſtry took the new revenue and the Engliſh Parliament altered the original propoſition. Pending theſe alterations, ſome members of our houſe ſpoke on the ſubject, and pledged themſelves that they ſhould on the return of the propoſitions give them oppoſition in caſe they ſhould be altered even in an iota. I recollect Mr. Foſter ſpeaking to that point, he did not ſo pledge himſelf, but I perfectly recollect that the then attorney general did; the pamphlet has given reaſons for the inconſtancy of his ſentiments, give me leave to juſtify the uniformity of mine. The bill founded on the altered propoſitions departed from the original ones in the following particulars: it ſtipulated for a perpetual revenue bill it ſtipulated in certain leading and eſſential matters for a covenant of referential legiſlation, it included in that covenant four articles of American commerce, it ſtipulated for the reduction of our duties of protection on cotton among others, and it gave us nothing in ſubſtance but the re-export trade which we have gotten without it. To the public it is ſufficient to ſay ſo much, to the pamphlet it is unneceſſary to ſay any thing; but when that pamphlet calls oppoſition to thoſe altered propoſitions a breach with England and a ſacrifice of the common intereſt on the altar of faction, the author ſhould be reminded, that the perſon whoſe name it aſſumes had pledged himſelf to oppoſe thoſe altered propoſitions; that is, according to the pamphlet, to cauſe that breach with England and to make that ſacrifice on the altar

of

of faction; and alſo that a great part of the preſent cabinet of England did actually execute what the pamphlet calls a breach with England, and ſacrificed the common intereſt on the altar of faction—Lord Auckland, the Duke of Portland and moſt of his connexions. But we ſtand in need of no authorities; did we, I ſhould quote Mr. Denis Daly, the then muſter maſter, who declared he could not ſupport the altered propoſitions. The truth is, the oppoſition to the bill which comprehended them, was no breach with England, however there might indeed mix in the debate an offenſive diſpoſition to contraſt the two nations; but we muſt always diſtinguiſh between the nature of the queſtion itſelf and the craft of the expectant flattering the court of England by reviling his own country for his private advantage.

We follow the pamphlet to the regency, and here its charge againſt the country is not her conduct but her power. The pamphlet reprobates the right of Ireland to chooſe a regent; now, ſhe is not reſponſible for the right but the exerciſe of it, and we have ſhewn that ſhe exerciſed that right for the preſervation of the monarchy, and the connection. The pamphlet ſtates the power of choice to be tantamount to a power of ſeparation; but who gave that power? it was the law; and who diſplayed that power? the miniſter; it was he who ſtated that the two houſes of Parliament in caſe of regal incapacity could ſupply the deficiency exactly as they thought proper, when a ſervant of Government here maintained that the houſes of the Britiſh Parliament could do more, and could provide for the deficiency in Ireland as well as in England, that is to ſay, could republicanize both countries. He did not make our ſitnation better, nor give any great ſecurity to the monarchy or the conſtitution.

The

The pamphlet aſſerts, that if the proceedings of our Parliament could have any effect, we were ſeparated for ſome weeks from England. Now if we were ſeparated for an hour, it was not by the proceedings of Parliament, that is to ſay, by the addreſs to the Prince, which never had effect, but by the indiſpoſition of his Majeſty, which had effect, and which alone had effect to ſuſpend the royal function and of courſe the only connecting power of the two countries.

The pamphlet having confounded the proceedings of Parliament with cauſes which Parliament found but did not produce, proceeds to a groſs miſrepreſentation of concomitant circumſtances. It charges on the Parliament the crime of expedition, but it does not ſtate the cauſe of it; one cauſe was the ſedition of the Iriſh miniſter;—that miniſtry apprehended diſmiſſal and were forming an oppoſition. The then repreſentative of Majeſty in Ireland was ſuppoſed to be employed at that time in canvaſſing for a party againſt the future Government with the king's commiſſion in his pocket. Thus his Royal Highneſs would have been a regent in chains with a court in mutiny.

The pamphlet charges the commons at that time with diſreſpect to the king, marked by the limitation of the ſupply. The fact is true, but it is not true as the pamphlet ſtates it—the commons abridged the grant of the ſupply becauſe the King's miniſter in Ireland could not be truſted, and he could not be truſted for the following reaſons:—becauſe he had declared he would make certain members of Parliament victims of their votes, becauſe he had cenſured the Parliament and the Parliament had cenſured him, and becauſe one of his ſervants had pronounced in Parliament the neceſſity of reſorting to the rankeſt corruption. It was for theſe reaſons that Parliament did not think proper to truſt either with the revenues of the country.

The

The pamphlet aſſerts, that the Iriſh Parliament proceeded without a tittle of evidence; it is not the fact. The pamphlet, indeed, acknowledges that its own charge is not true, by making another, namely, that the Houſe of Commons did not attend to the evidence. Here it is as deficient in candour as before in fact; the caſe was, that the report of the phiſician regarding the ſtate of his Majeſty's health, had appeared before in every paper; it was a ſubject too intereſting and too melancholy not to be perfectly known, and was read in the Houſe, pro forma. On this part of the ſubject, the pamphlet is, in an eminent degree, indecorous and licencious, when it ſpeaks of the Houſe of Commons; nor is it leſs ſo when it ſpeaks of the perſons concerned in the proceedings of that time, as of a ſet of men who had accompliſhed a breach between Great Britain and Ireland, and had committed (I think the words of the charge are), *enormities*, The perſons guilty of thoſe enormities were ſome of the preſent ſervants of the crown, a majority of two Houſes of Parliament, ſeveral biſhops, a great part of the preſent cabinet of England, the Duke of Partland and his party, Lord Spencer, who was to have been Lord Lieutenant, and Mr. Pelham, who was to have been his Secretary—were it not preſumptious, I might aſcend much higher.

An alliance to play againſt England the independency of Ireland, whoſe baſis was to prevent meaſures of concord—a breach made between the two countries in 85, and now their enormities in the addreſs on the regency, are charges againſt the Duke of Portland's party very unfounded and very puerile, but made with great boldneſs by the author, who ſeems to enjoy a genius for crimination, which in its extent and extravagance, becomes harmleſs. The phamplet charges on that period mueh indecorum. I do lament it.

" You

" You have ſet up a little king of your own, ſaid a princi-
pal ſervant of the crown, ſpeaking to the Houſe of Com-
mons, and talking of his Prince with the vulgar familiarity
with which one ſlave would ſalute his fellow." " Half a
" million or more was expended ſome years ago, to break
" an oppoſition, the ſame or a greater ſum may be neceſſary
" now"; ſo ſaid the principal ſervant of the crown. The
Houſe heard him, I heard him, he ſaid it ſtanding on his legs
to an aſtoniſhed Houſe, and an indignant nation, and he
ſaid ſo in the moſt extenſive ſenſe of bribery and corrup-
tion. The threat was proceeded on, the peerage was ſold, the
caitiffs of corruption were every where, in the lobby, in the
ſtreet, on the ſteps, and at the door of every parliamentary
leader whoſe threſholds were worn by the members of the
then adminiſtration, offering titles to ſome, amneſty to others,
and corruption to all. Hence aroſe the diſcontents of which
the pamphlet complains—againſt ſuch proceedings, and the
profligate avowal of ſuch proceedings, againſt the conſe-
quences that followed—they were many and bloody, we did
then, and we beg now to enter once more our ſolemn pro-
teſt.

Could that nation, who had refuſed to obey the legiſla-
tive power of the Britiſh Parliament, who had armed for
her defence and her freedom, who had recovered her trade,
reinſtated her conſtitution, and acquired a great, and it ſhall
not be my fault, if it be not an immortal name—could they
who had taken a part for that nation, in all her glorious ac-
quiſitions—could the nation or ſuch men, could both for-
get themſelves, and ſupport a rank inſtrument of power, and
become its little comrade, and its copander in its dirty doings,
in the ſale of the peerage, conſpiracies againſt Parliament,
and its vile and vulgar abuſe of the people.

A pamphlet

A pamphlet of 98, publiſhed in the name of the ſame author, is pleaſed to mention, that the experiment of conciliation had been fully and abundantly tried, and it particularly inſtances, the acknowledgement of our Parliamentary conſtitution—it was an experiment, magnanimous on the part of Great Britain, and her then miniſter, and we ought to take this public opportunity, of making acknowledgements to both, but we muſt lament, that their noble purpoſes were counteracted, and their wiſe experiment betrayed by a calamitous aſcendency in the Iriſh Cabinet, from 89 of the above councils, at once ſervile and inſolent who had oppoſed the eſtabliſhment of the Iriſh Conſtitution, and ſcarce were they placed in power, when they planned its overthrow, ſet up a counter experiment, or conſpiracy, to undo what England thought ſhe had recognized, and Ireland thought ſhe had ſecured, that very parliamentary conſtitution, our bond of connexion, and pledge of peace, and took two methods to accompliſh their crime, both of which, they proclaimed with much public immodeſty, but without danger; a project to pack a Parliament and a project to aboliſh it.

We follow the work, it complains of the Whig Club, the miniſter was the author of it—his doctrine, and his half million were the authors of it, but Clubs of this kind are only preſerved by violence, that violence did happen —an attack was made on the rights of the city, a doctrine was promulgated, that the common council had no right to put a negative on the Lord Mayor, choſen by the board of Aldermen, except the board itſelf ſhould aſſent to the negative put on its own choice, this doctrine was advanced by the court, to ſecure the election of the mayor to itſelf; in the courſe of the conteſt, a miniſter involved himſelf in a perſonal altercation with the

the citizens—with Mr. Tandy, he had carried on a long war, and with various ſucceſs—he was now involved in an altercation more general, in the compaſs of his wrath—he paid his compliments to the Whig Club, and that club advanced the ſhield of a free people over the rights of the city, and humbled a miniſter in the preſence of thoſe citizens whoſe privileges he had invaded, and whoſe perſons he had calumniated. The pamphlet charges the club with a crime on account of a publication on the ſubject of the poor, pending a probable invaſion—idle charge. At this time of a probable invaſion, is a ſociety formed for the very purpoſe of inveſtigating their condition with ſome of the officers of ſtate, and ſeveral clergy at its head.—At ſuch a time did ſome of the Engliſh clergy publiſh treatiſes proving, that the peaſantry could not live by their labour—did the author read a very learned pamphlet in favor of the Union, publiſhed by Mr. Douglaſs, at a time of apprehended invaſion, recommending Union as the beſt means of relieving the lower order from the oppreſſion of the rich, and then he quotes Adam Smith—did the author read Mr. Pitt's pamphlet, publiſhed pending an apprehended invaſion and condoling with the peaſantry of Ireland, on the great *practical grievance* of tythes? But to have done with ſuch triffling, we follow the work to its charge againſt the propounders of the reform plan of 97—the work ſets forth two plans, that of thoſe gentlemen, and that of the United Iriſhmen—they differ in the following eſſentials—the plan of the former left the counties as they are, the former did not propoſe to annualize Parliament—the former rejected the idea of perſonal repreſentation, the former did not propoſe to aboliſh the oath taken by the elector. What then did the former do—it deſtroyed boroughs, and it propoſed to ſupply their place by the preſent freemen and freeholders, that is, by thoſe whom the law calls

calls the Commons—it created no new conſtituency, but it did what every plan of reform profeſſes to emulate—it gave repreſentation to the conſtituency, that is, to the Commons in the place of the monopoliſt—when I ſay it made no new conſtituency—I beg to make an exception, it introduced in the place of the potwalloper as he is termed, ſubſtantial leaſeholders and ſubſtantial houſeholders, that is, it gave property more weight, and population diſtinct from property leſs weight—on the whole it took away the monopoliſt and the potwalloping rabble, and communicated the repreſentatation of the kingdom to the proprietors thereof, as conſtituted its electors by law, or as entitled to become ſuch by a property greater than the law had required.

The effect of this plan had been to prevent an Union; if we are to advert to the evidence of the priſoner examined by the Houſes of Parliament, it had been to prevent a rebellion, and to break off a French connection. When the pamphlet ſets forth that Mr. O'Connor, &c.* approved of this plan it ſhould have ſtated the whole truth, or have ſtated nothing; it has done neither. It has ſuppreſſed their declaration which was, that had that plan taken place, they would have broken off their connection with France.

Neither the hiſtory of that reform, nor the hiſtory of any public meaſure, does the writer ſet forth. A plan of reform

* The author is pleaſed to term Mr. O'Connor our *unreſerved* friend—in his manifeſto, ſhewed to the Iriſh government for permiſſion to publiſh, Mr. O'Connor ſets forth that ſave only on the queſtion of reform, he had no communication with us of any kind whatever---that manifeſto muſt have been read by the author of the pamphlet, who thus makes another charge he ſhould have known to be groundleſs, and which he is now called on to maintain. We do not call for legal evidence, but if the author has any evidence at all, ſuch as would convince an honeſt man of the truth of any of thoſe charges, or juſtify an honeſt man in making them, he is called upon and requeſted to produce that evidence.

had been propoſed in 93, and debated in 94. It was objected firſt, that the plan did not give ſatisfaction; in that the moſt vehement partizans of parliamentary reform had ſignified their diſapprobation—ſecondly, that the plan opened the way to another plan or to the project of perſonal repreſentation. It became highly expedient before any other plan was ſubmitted to the conſideration of Parliament, to be able to aſſure that auguſt body, that ſuch plan would give general ſatisfaction, and put an end to the project of perſonal repreſentation. The perſons concerned in the forming that plan, did accordingly obtain from the north of Ireland, and moreover from the advocates of perſonal repreſentation, authority to declare in Parliament, that if the plan of 97 ſhould paſs, they would reſt ſatisfied. If a further anſwer to the author be neceſſary, it is his own avowal of his own principle, viz. that no Iriſh repreſentation at all is neceſſary, and that he ſhould be ſatisfied to be governed by the Engliſh Parliament, without a ſingle repreſentative. With ſuch a perſon, I ſhall no further diſcuſs the ſubject of repreſentation.

We follow the work to the Catholic queſtion: It is pleaſed to quote me as follows, "Let me adviſe you by "no means to poſtpone the conſideration of your fortunes "till after the war, your phyſical conſequence exiſts in a "ſtate of *ſeperation from England*, &c." I am extremely ſorry to be obliged to declare again what I have been compelled to do ſo often; that this paragraph publiſhed as mine by the author of the pamphlet, is not miſinterpretation, not miſrepreſentation, but *palpable fabrication*. I never ſaid nor publiſhed, that the phyſical conſequence of any part of his Majeſty's ſubjects exiſted in a ſtate of ſeperation from England, nor any thing that would warrant that interpretation; but I did ſay the reverſe—that as our domeſtic ſecurity conſiſted in concord with another, ſo our

ſecurity

ſecurity againſt an invader from abroad, depended on our connexion with Great Britain. On this expreſſion then boldly attributed to me, but which I never delivered, the author founds two charges as deſtitute of truth and unreal as the foundation on which they reſt—a charge of revolution and jacobiniſm. The author in a production ſanctioned by his name, in one of the public papers, is made to ſay that a certain party had reſorted to the Catholic Bill as a new ſubject of diſcontent, after the Place and Penſion Bill had been conceded: here again I am forced to lament the neceſſity of declaring that this aſſertion alſo is totally and abſolutely deſtitute of foundation—and I will prove its departure from the fact, by the proceedings of Parliament. The firſt Catholic Bill after that of 1782, paſſed in 92—the ſecond, early in the ſeſſion of 93—and the place and penſion bill did not paſs till the cloſe of it, ſo that the *refutation* of the charge, appears on the rolls of Parliament. As to the laſt Catholic Bill, they to whom he alludes, did not reſort to it as a new ſubject of diſcontent to annoy the government, being at that time themſelves the adminiſtration—it follows, there is an arithmetic and moral impoſſibility of the truth of this charge of the author. I beg indulgence in addition, to ſtate a few facts—the Catholics were not excited to come forward by an oppoſition, they were induced to come forward by Mr. Mitford's Bill in 91—they came at the latter end of the ſeſſion of that year to ſome of our party, myſelf among others, to know whether we ſhould not adviſe them to petition Parliament for further indulgences—my anſwer was, I am your friend, but go to the Secretary and conſult him; don't narrow your cauſe to the fate of an oppoſition and a minority. I give this advice as a friend to your body—in the winter of 91, I was applied to Mr. R. Burke with a requeſt to know my ſentiments on the Catholic ſubject, which I did not diſcloſe to him, declaring at the ſame time, my good wiſhes to the Catholic body, and

on the opening of the ſeſſion, in January 92, I gave the Catholic a decided ſupport. Forgetting this, the pamphlet quotes a declaration, " that the Catholics could not induce any one member of Parliament to patronize their petition. This declaration was publiſhed, December, 92, and the author charges from thence, that until the petition was recommended by miniſters, we had been catholic perſecutors. That charge alſo is a departure from fact, I remember giving in ſupport of the catholic petition, and claims a decided voice and vote in 1792.

In January, 93, their claims came recommended from the throne, and in ſupporting their bill ſo recommended; I obſerved, that however, I might think it were judicious to go farther, I did think the bill communicated, moſt important rights. In the ſeſſion of 94, the catholic ſubject was not mentioned, but in ſummer, on a change being made in the Britiſh Cabinet, being informed by ſome of the leading perſons therein, that the adminiſtration of the Iriſh department was to belong to them, and that they had ſent for us to adopt our meaſures, I ſtated the catholic emancipation, as one of them. Thus the charge that we were originally perſecutors of the catholics appears to be a departure from the fact. Thus the charge that we took up the catholics after the paſſing of the place and penſion bill, as Iriſh matter of oppoſition, appears likewiſe to be a departure from fact. The proofs are in the proceedings of Parliament.

The pamphlet of 98, in he authors name, has ſaid, that the experiment of conciliation was abundantly tried. Here is the ſecond experiment, and here it is but juſt, to acknowledge the wiſdom of his Majeſty, and the benignity of his intentions,

intentions, when he was graciouſly pleaſed to recommend the Catholics in 1793, in his ſpeech from the Throne, ſo that this body thus royally patronized, might be attached not only to the conſtitution, whoſe privileges they were to participate, but to the great perſonage, alſo, at whoſe ſpecial interpoſition, they were thus parentally, and majeſtically recommended. But as in the firſt experiment, the people of England, ſo in the ſecond, was his Majeſty betrayed, by thoſe infatuated, weak, and pernicious counſels, which had been in 89, the inſtruments of political corruption, and now became the horn of religious diſcord.

I will give the learned author every advantage, and ſuppoſe contrary to my fixed and unalterable opinion, the policy of excluding the Catholics from the Conſtitution; yet ſhould I nevertheleſs condemn the hoſtile, and outrageous manner in which that excluſion, was defended, "If, ſays he, the Catholics do not ſubvert the proteſtant government, they muſt reſiſt the ruling paſſions, and propenſities of the human mind; they can never be cordially affected to his Majeſty's Government. I am confident, the old roman ſuperſtition, is as rank in Ireland now, as in 41—the profound ignorance of the lower order, the general abhorrence of the proteſtant religion, by the people, qualify them to receive any impreſſion their prieſts can make, and if their minds be diveſted of veneration for the prieſt, ſuch is the ignorance, and barbarity of they people, that the would fall into a ſtate of rude nature—the popiſh ſuperſtitition is not confined to the lower order, it flouriſhes in full vigour, amongſt the higher order."

This was the language, improper becauſe not founded in fact, and impolitic and indecent in a miniſter, though the

the facts could ſupport it. The beſt way to diſtinguiſh the indecorum of ſuch ſpeech, is to advert to a ſpeech made on the ſame ſide of the queſtion by a gentleman who ſaid every thing that could be urged againſt their pretenſions, without uttering a ſingle ſyllable which could give offence to their perſons, ſo that the Catholics might much more eaſily forgive the latter his vote, than the former his ſpeech, and on a compariſon of the two productions, you will ſee the eminent ſuperiority of ſenſe with temper over talents without it. There are two ſides in this queſtion which men of principle might take, for the meaſure or againſt it, but the miniſtry that took both parts could be juſtified by neither; the fact was, that the miniſtry encouraged the Proteſtants, and forſook them afterward; they brought forward the grand juries, and left them alſo—then to the Catholics—then to the Proteſtants—then back again to the Catholic, and then to the Proteſtants once more. This was a great miſtake, but there was a greater, and that was to be found in thoſe ſpeeches and publications from a quarter in high confidence, which vilified the acts of conceſſion in the moment of conferring them, and affecting to ſupport the King's Government, called the bill he had recommended *an act of inſanity*; the incoherent plan was erroneous, but this was infatuation, it was the petulance of power, it was the inſolence of wealth, it was the intoxication of ſudden and giddy elevation, breathing out on a great and ancient deſcription of his Majeſty's ſubjects, the phrenzy of his politics and the fury of his faith, with all the impoveriſhed anger of a feveriſh and diſtempered intellect. It went to deprive the Proteſtant aſcendancy of the advantage of temper, and of the graciouſneſs of good manners which ſhould always belong to the powerful ſect; it went to deprive the ſtate of a certain comelineſs of deportment and mild dignity which ſhould always belong to Government; it fought in the king's co-

lours

lours againſt the king's benevolence, it went to deprive his Majeſty of the bleſſings of gratitude and his people of the bleſſings of concord; it went to corrode where the crown had intended to heal, and it curdled with the temper of the miniſter, the manna that was deſcending from the throne.

The argument that accompanied this invective was of little moment; a man in a fury can't argue; the weakneſs of his reaſoning will be exactly in proportion to the ſtrength of his paſſion.

Behold a melancholy example of the victory of human paſſion over the human underſtanding. The preſent danger of the papal power after the depoſition of the Pope, the incompatibility of the real preſence, and the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, with the intereſt of the Houſe of Hanover and the incompetency of Parliament to alter the oaths of its own members, ſuch are the author's the arguments. However, if the pamphlet of 98 denies the competence of Parliament, here comes the pamphlet of 1800 to conſole you, and as the one ſets the law above the law-maker, ſo the other ſets the law-maker above the Conſtitution, and both together would prove that the legiſlature is incompetent to admit a Catholic, but is perfectly competent to deſtroy a Parliament.

We leave theſe arguments and the vehement ſpirit with which they are poured forth, and come to the cloſe of the pamphlet and the beginning of the ſubject, the Union. Of 101 pages, 26 only are devoted to the queſtion, the reſt contain feelings, battles, and fores from a perpetual encounter with all deſcriptions of men and with patriotiſm in all ages. As the author ſcarcely argues the queſtion of Union or indeed affects it, here I ſhall ſay but little; howevertwo great points

he

he would eſtabliſh I beg to advert to. They contain poſitions which are not only glaringly unfounded but exceedingly dangerous: the 1ſt, that this country is unable to pay her eſtabliſhments, 2d, that her Conſtitution is incompetent to provide for her ſecurity. He attempts to warrant his firſt by a ſtatement affecting to prove that in three years if ſhe was to continue without an Union, we ſhall owe 50,000,000l. He ſtates that we borrow annually 8,000,000, he ſhould have ſtated that we borrow but 4,000,000; whatever capital we may create on each loan, he ſhould have ſtated how much leſs we ſhould borrow on the adoption of an Union. He ſhould have ſtated that the projectors of the Union only proffered the payment of 1,000,000 of our war eſtabliſhment, that the preſent year was provided for, that the ſaving in the two following years of war will be, according to this proffer, but 2,000,000, and the purchaſe of boroughs will be 1,500,000. He ſhould have ſtated further that our war contribution was rated at 4,400,000, and that our preſent war expence was only 4,652,000, ſo that the proffer appears fallacious, and if we be unable to ſupport our preſent war expence, we will be unable to ſupport our war contribution, and the reader will obſerve the preſent war expence is an occaſional war eſtabliſhment, principally cauſed by inſurrection, whereas the war contribution will in all probability be a permanent war contribution, except as far as it may be augmented*. But there is an anſwer to his argument which is more deciſive, it is his own argument in 1798 which is as follows: "Firſt, as to the adequacy of the Conſtitution for the purpoſe of ſecurity aud connexion, then for that of wealth and proſperity.

A Parliament

* See Lord Farnham's moſt excellent pamphlet, and likewiſe his moſt judicious ſpeech on the ſubject of Union.

" A Parliament, perfectly diſtinct from, and independent of the other Parliament, forms a ſyſtem the moſt critical and complicated ; to a common obſerver, utterly impracticable ; but experience has proved, that in the midſt of popular turbulence, and in the convulſion of rancorous and violent party conteſts, the Iriſh Parliament, as it is now conſtituted, is fully competent to all political and beneficial purpoſes of Government ; that it is fully competent to protect this, which is the weaker Country, againſt encroachment, and to ſave the Empire from diſſolution, by maintaining the Conſtitutional connexion of Ireland with the Britiſh Crown."—Here is the refutatton of his ſecond great argument publiſhed by himſelf. Hear him conquer himſelf in his pamphlet of 98—here (page 5) he writes as follows " there is not a Nation in the habitable globe, " which has advanced in cultivation and commerce, in " agriculture and manufactures, with the ſame rapidity in " the ſame period,"—ſpeaking of Ireland ſince the Conſtitution of 82 viz. for the laſt 20 years.

Here we add nothing, but that the author has been, by his own account, recommending an Union for theſe eight years; he has been, according to his own account, betraying the Conſtitution in the very moments of his panegyric.

On this important diſcovery let others expatiate ; to us it is more material to obſerve on his work, where it ſets up our Hiſtory againſt our Conſtitution, and the annals of the Parliament againſt its legiſlative capacity. To eſtabliſh this, he has thought it prudent to advert to four periods, in which the greateſt legiſlative queſtions were ſucceſsfully diſcuſſed, and the greateſt legiſlative abilities were triumphantly diſplayed.

This pamphlet quotes the period of 1753, and relates, that a queſtion regarding a ſurplus in the treaſury was

then ſtarted, to try the ſtrength of two factions; which, in its conſequence, tranſmitted a ſpirit, that afterwards degraded the Parliament; what, when, or where, this Parliamentary degradation appeared, we are at a loſs to diſcover; this is not hiſtory, nor comment, nor fact, but it is a garbling of hiſtory to eſtabliſh a concluſion the oppoſite of that which the hiſtory itſelf would adminiſter; the principle then determined, the importance of that principle, the abilities diſplayed on the diſcuſſion of it, the real effect of both on the public mind, have eſcaped the pen of the hiſtorian; from that pen you would collect, that Mr. Malone and Mr. Pery were nothing more than two prize-fighters, embattled in the cauſe of faction, under two great ſtate criminals, the Primate and Lord Shannon; that they agitated a matter of no moment, but that they propagated ſedition of great moment, and fatal conſequences to the next generation.

Having thus diſpoſed of the Parliament, and the characters of 53, without the vexation of any ſtudy, or ſordid obligation to fact, the pamphlet proceeds to diſpoſe of the character of the Houſe of Commons and the principal Gentlemen of the country for 15 years longer. It had before repreſented them as incendiaries, it here repreſents them as plunderers; it ſets forth, that under the pretext of public improvement, the Commons plundered the country; and that their Parliament, to pay their Parliamentary following, plundered the treaſury, until they impoſed on the crown, the neceſſity of reſorting for ſupply to Parliament; which the author moſt pathetically bemoans, and which he ſeems to think the only great grievance of the country.

Having given this Hiſtory of Parliament, from (53) to (68) it advances to the adminiſtration of Lord Townſhend;

ſhend, in which it ſeems to recollect nothing but the noiſe of oppoſition.

The pamphlet of 98, in the name of the author, had obſerved, that from the revolution of 82, the ſyſtem adopted by thoſe in whom the power reſided (they were thoſe, among others, whom he had juſt been pleaſed to reprobate, as incendiaries and plunderers) was to cement the connexion which had ſo long ſubſiſted between Great Britain and Ireland, to their mutual advantage; the pamphlet of 1800 is pleaſed to obſerve, that the precedent of their government, was fatal; and that a ſyſtem was formed on it, that would beat down any nation on earth; accordingly, it ſtates, that the Engliſh Government opened their eyes, ſhook indeed the ariſtocracy, but generated a race of political adventurers, full of noiſe and indecorum. I think I have heard ſpruce authority as petulant and indecorous as young ambition. The attempts of the court to pack a Parliament at that period, the encreaſe of the eſtabliſhment, for that purpoſe, the great abilities diſplayed, the altered money-bill, proteſts, prorogation, in ſhort, the hiſtory of the period, once more eſcapes this hiſtorian. The learned author now approaches the year 79—the expedition of his march is very great, and very liberally does he leave untouched every thing behind him; he is arrived; and here he ſcarcely is ſtricken with any thing worthy his hiſtory, ſave only the weakneſs of Lord Buckinghamſhire, in arraying the Volunteers, and the illiberality of the nation, in demanding a free trade; the pamphlet commends the Volunteers of that period; and yet I think I remember a young Barriſter going forth in his cock-boat, and ſcolding the waves of that ocean, and the waves regarded him not. Certainly the Volunteers did take a moſt deciſive part in the political and commercial queſtion of that day. Well, he has done with the year 79; whatever he had to ſay on

the great queſtions then diſcuſſed, and on that moſt pregnant period, in a few lines he has ſaid it; hiſtory is nothing in his hands; in his account of the Parliament of Ireland for 30 years, the learned author has five ideas, and thoſe are all; faction in 53; plunder till 68; then the noiſe of oppoſition; then the weakneſs of government; then the ungenerous proceedings of Parliament; and as he before condemned your efforts to recover your trade, with oblique cenſure, ſo now he condemns your efforts to recover your conſtitution, with direct animadverſion; he calls the ſettlement of 82, the ſeperation of a colony from Great Britain; bold adulation of England, this; the alledged author of the pamphlet, was in Parliament the 16th of April, 82; he made no objection to this ſeparation; he was in Parliament, the 27th of May, 82; he made no objection to the ſeparation; he wrote me a letter of congratulation at that time, on the ſucceſs of that ſettlement; he did not there mention this ſeparation. Reading this publication now, and in the ſociety of the two other pamphlets of the ſame name, every Iriſhman feels himſelf leſs a gentleman, and more a ſlave. The pamphlet in its oblique cenſure, and in its direct animadverſion, diſparages every great act, and every diſtinguiſhed character in this country, for the laſt 50 years.

Mr. Malone, Lord Pery, late Lord Shannon, Duke of Leinſter, the Mr. Ponſonbys, Mr. Brownlow, Sir William Oſborne, Mr. Burgh, Mr. Daly, Mr. Yelverton, Mr. Ogle, Mr. Flood, Mr. Forbes, Lord Charlemont, and myſelf; I follow the author through the graves of theſe honourable dead men, for moſt of them are ſo; and I beg to raiſe up their tombſtones, as he throws them down; I feel it more inſtructive to converſe with their aſhes, than with his compoſitions.

Mr. Malone,

Mr. Malone, one of the characters of 53, was a man of the fineſt intellect that any country ever produced.—"The three ableſt men I have ever heard, were Mr. Pitt, "(the Father) Mr. Murray and Mr. Malone; for a popular "aſſembly I would chuſe Mr. Pitt; for a Privy Council, "Murray; for twelve wiſe men, Malone." This was the opinion which Lord Sackville, the ſecretary of 53, gave, of Mr. Malone to a Gentleman from whom I heard it. "He is a great ſea in a calm" ſaid Mr. Gerrard Hamilton, another great judge of men and talents; "aye," it was replied, "but had you ſeen him when he was young, you would have ſaid he was a great ſea in a ſtorm;" and like the ſea whether in calm or ſtorm, he was a great production of Nature.

Lord Pery, he is not yet canonized by death; but he, like the reſt, has been canonized by ſlander. He was more or leſs a party in all thoſe meaſures, which the pamphlet condemns; and indeed in every great ſtatute and meaſure that took place in Ireland the laſt 50 years; a man of the moſt legiſlative capacity I ever knew, and the moſt comprehenſive reach of underſtanding I ever ſaw; with a deep engraven impreſſion of public care, accompanied by a temper which was tranquillity itſelf, and a perſonal firmneſs that was adamant; in his train, is every private virtue that can adorn human Nature.

Mr. Brownlow, Sir Wm. Oſborne, I wiſh we had more of theſe criminals;—the former ſeconded the addreſs of 82—and in the latter and in both, there was a ſtation of mind, that would have become the proudeſt ſenate in Europe.

Mr. Flood, my rival, as the pamphlet calls him—and I ſhould be unworthy the character of his rival, if in his

grave I did not do him juſtice—he had his faults; but he had great powers; great public effect; he perſuaded the old, he inſpired the young; the Caſtle vaniſhed before him; on a ſmall ſubject he was miſerable; put into his hand, a diſtaff, and, like Hercules, he made ſad work of it; but give him the thunder-bolt, and he had the arm of a Jupiter; he misjudged when he transferred himſelf to the Engliſh Parliament; he forgot that he was a tree of the foreſt, too old, and too great to be tranſplanted at 50; and his ſeat in the Britiſh Parliament, is a caution to the friends of Union to ſtay at home, and make the country of their birth the ſeat of their action.

Mr. Burgh, another great perſon in thoſe ſcenes, which it is not in the little quill of this author to depreciate.—He was a man ſingularly gifted—with great talent; great variety; wit, oratory, and logic; he too had his weakneſs;—but he had the pride of genius alſo; and ſtrove to raiſe his country along with himſelf; and never ſought to build his elevation on the degradation of Ireland.

I moved an amendment for a free export; he moved a better amendment, and he loſt his place; I moved a declaration of right; "with my laſt breath will I ſup-"port the right of the Iriſh Parliament," was his note to me, when I applied to him for his ſupport; he loſt the chance of recovering his place, and his way to the ſeals, for which he might have bartered. The gates of promotion were ſhut on him, as thoſe of glory opened.

Mr. Daly, my beloved friend—he, in a great meaſure, drew the addreſs of 79, in favour of our trade; that "ungracious meaſure;" and he ſaw, read, and approved of the addreſs of 82, in favour of Conſtitution; that addreſs of "ſeparation;" he viſited me in my illneſs, at

that

that moment, and I had communication on thoſe ſubjects, with that man, whoſe powers of oratory were next to perfection; and whoſe powers of underſtanding, I might ſay, from what has lately happened, bordered on the ſpirit of prophecy.

Mr. Forbes, a name I ſhall ever regard, and a death I ſhall ever deplore—enlightened, ſenſible, laborious and uſeful—proud in poverty, and patriotic, he preferred exile to apoſtacy, and met his death. I ſpeak of the dead, I ſay nothing of the living, but that I attribute to this conſtellation of men, in a great meaſure, the privileges of your country; and I attribute ſuch a generation of men, to the reſidence of your Parliament.

The Miniſters of the Crown, who, in the times related by the pamphlet, did the King's buſineſs, were reſpectable and able men; they ſupported ſometimes acts of power, but they never, by any ſhocking declaration, outraged the Conſtitution; they adjuſted themſelves to the idea of liberty, even when they might have offended againſt the principle, and always kept on terms of decency with the People and their privileges; leaſt of all, did they indulge in a termagant vulgarity, debaſing, to a plebeian level, courts and ſenates, and mortgaging Iriſh infamy on a ſpeculation of Britiſh promotion.

In the liſt of injured characters I beg leave to ſay a few words for the good and gracious Earl of Charlemont; an attack not only on his meaſures, but on his repreſentative, makes his vindication ſeaſonable; formed to unite ariſtocracy and the People, with the manners of a court and the principles of a patriot, with the flame of liberty, and the love of order, unaſſailable to the approaches of power, of profit, or of titles, he annexed to the love of freedom, a veneration

ration for order; and caſt on the crowd that followed him, the gracious ſhade of his own accompliſhments; ſo that the very rabble grew civilized, as it approached his perſon; for years did he preſide over a great army, without pay or reward; and he helped to accompliſh a great revolution, without a drop of blood.

Let ſlaves utter their ſlander, and bark at glory which is conferred by the People; his name will ſtand;—and when their clay ſhall be gathered to the dirt to which they belong, his monument, whether in marble, or in the hearts of his Countrymen, ſhall be conſulted as a ſubject of ſorrow, and a ſource of virtue.

Should the author of the pamphlet pray, he could not aſk for his ſon, a greater bleſſing, than to reſemble the good Earl of Charlemont; nor could that ſon repay that bleſſing by any act of gratitude more filial, than by committing to the flames his Father's publications.

I have attempted to vindicate the dead, let us now vindicate the Parliament. The queſtion of 53, was the beginning, in this country, of that Conſtitutional ſpirit which aſſerted afterwards the privilege of the Commons, and guarded and huſbanded the eſſential right of a free Conſtitution; the queſtion was of its very eſſence; but the effect ſpread beyond the queſtion, and the ability of the debate, inſtructed the Nation, and made her not only tenacious of her rights, but proud of her underſtanding. There might have been party—there might have been faction, mixing with a great public principle; ſo it was in the time of Ship Money;—ſo it was in the revolution;—in theſe inſtances the private motive mixed with the public cauſe; but ſtill it was the cauſe of the public and the cauſe of liberty; in great moral operations as well as in the great operations of Nature, there is always a degree of waſte

and

and overflow; ſo it is with the ſea; ſhall we therefore pronounce the ocean a nuiſance? thus, afterward, in the time which the pamphlet deſcribes as the period of plunder, there was a ſpirit of private jobbing, mixing with the ſpirit of public improvement; but that ſpirit of public improvement and the commencement and birth of public eaſe, was there alſo, and ſo continued, from the time of the profoundly ſagacious Lord Pery, to the time of Mr. Foſter and his wiſe regulations.

In the hiſtory of Parliament, I obſerve the learned hiſtorian omits her laws—the corn law—the octennial bill—the tenantry bill—he has not only forgotten *our* hiſtory but *his own*, and moſt impartially contradicts what is written by himſelf as well as others. "No Nation in the habitable "globe, in cultivation, in commerce, in agriculture, in "manufacture, has advanced in the ſame rapidity within "the ſame period," ſays the pamphlet of 98, in the name of our author (page 5); "a ſettlement ſo compleat and "ſatisfactory, as to render the revival of political or Con-"ſtitutional queſtions utterly impoſſible,"—ſo ſaid the ſame pamphlet, (page 9), ſpeaking of the ſettlement of 82; "a Parliament, (ſpeaking of the Iriſh Parliament) fully "competent to all practical and beneficial purpoſes of Go-"vernment, fully competent to preſerve this Country, "which is the weaker, againſt encroachment, and to ſave "the Empire from diſſolution, by maintaining the Con-"ſtitutional connexion with Great Britain,"—ſo ſaid the ſame pamphlet, ſpeaking of the Conſtitution of 82; thus have theſe different works furniſhed their own anſwers, and like oppoſite poiſon adminiſtered their cure and their contradiction:—In preparing that Conſtituion, and that trade, the Iriſh Parliament had great merit, and the ſervants of the Crown had great merit;—as the author has cenſured the proceedings of both, let me be their vindicator; thoſe ſervants of the Crown proved themſelves to be Iriſh-

men, and ſcorned to barter their honour for their office; that Parliament, whoſe conduct the pamphlet reprobates, had ſeen the Country, by reſtrictions on commerce, and by an illegal embargo on her proviſion trade, brought in 79, to a ſtate of bankruptcy; that Parliament had repoſed in the liberality of the Britiſh Parliament an inexorable confidence; that Parliament waited and waited, till ſhe found, after the Engliſh Seſſion of 78, nothing could be expected; and then, that Parliament (and here behold the recuperative principles of our Conſtitution, and contemplate Parliament, as the true ſource of legitimate hope, tho' ſometimes the juſt object of public diſapprobation), that Parliament at length preferred a demand; I ſay a demand; for a free trade, expreſſed in a ſentence, the grievances of a Country; they ſhorten the Money Bill, aſſert the ſpirit of the Country, and ſupported as they were by the whole Nation, break in one hour, that chain, which had blocked up your harbours for ages; they follow this by a ſupport of Government and of Empire, as ample as was their ſupport of their Country and her commerce, bold and irreſiſtible, and do more to deter and intimidate the common enemy, than all your preſent loans, and all your eſtabliſhments.

I come to the ſecond period; and here they fall back; here they act reluctantly; but here you ſee again the rallying principle of our Conſtitution; that very Parliament, whom the pamphlet villifies, whom the Miniſter thought he had at his feet, thoſe very Gentlemen, whom the pamphlet diſparages, whom the then Secretary relied on, as a rank majority, made a common cauſe with the People; made a common cauſe with their liberties; and aſſiſted and backed by the voice of that people, preſerved, carried, and eſtabliſhed, the claim, inheritance, and liberties of the realm, and ſent the Secretary poſt to England, to recant his political errors in his own country, and to regiſter that recantation in the rolls of his

own

own Parliament. Theſe atchievements we are to eſtimate, not by the difficulties of the day, but by the difficulties reſulting from the depreſſion and degradation of ages. If we conſider that the People and Parliament, who had thus aſſociated for the defence of the realm, and had added to the objects of their aſſociation, the cauſe of trade and liberty, without which that realm did not deſerve to be defended; had been in a great meaſure excluded from all the reſt of the world, had been depreſsed for 100 years, by commercial and political oppreſſion, and torn by religious diviſions; that their Miniſters had not ſeldom applied themſelves to taint the integrity of the higher order, and very ſeldom (except as far as they concurred in the bounties of the legiſlature) applied themſelves to relieve the condition of the lower order; that ſuch a people and ſuch a parliament ſhould, ſpontaneouſly aſſociate, unite, arm, array, defend, illuſtrate, and free their country; overawe bigotry, ſuppreſs riot, prevent invaſion, and produce, as the offspring of their own head armed cap-a-pee, like the Goddeſs of Wiſdom iſſuing from the Thunderer, *Commerce* and *Conſtitution*; what ſhall we ſay of ſuch a People, and ſuch a Parliament? let the author of the pamphlet retire to his cloſet, and aſk pardon of his God, for what he has written againſt his country!

I ſtate theſe things, becauſe theſe things have been called clamour; I ſtate theſe facts, in oppoſition to ſlander, as the defence of my country; to reſtore from calumny, the character of her Conſtitution; and to reſcue from oblivion, the decaying evidences of her glory.

I think I know my country—I think I have a right to know her; ſhe has her weakneſſes; were ſhe perfect one would admire her more, but love her leſs. The Gentlemen of Ireland act on ſudden impulſe; but that impulſe

is

is the reſult of a warm heart, a ſtrong head, and great perſonal determination; the errors, incidental to ſuch a principle of action, muſt be their errors; but then, the virtues belonging to that principle, muſt be their virtues alſo; ſuch errors may give a pretence to their enemies, but ſuch virtues afford ſalvation to their country; the Miniſter ſhould therefore ſay, what I ſay to my country—I, who am no better than one of yourſelves, but far ſuperior to your tyrant, who probably partake of your defects, and ſhall be ſatisfied if I have any portion either of your ſpirit, or of your fire—"Come—come to this heart, with "all your infirmities, and all your religion."

We return to the publication; we look for ſomething to build or plant in the immenſe waſte, the huge moral devaſtation this writing has left, of the talents, ability, and credit of the country. Three pamphlets of this author lie open before me, a publication of 93, another of 98, and the preſent of 1800, all in the ſame name. Here we are to look, I ſuppoſe, for whatever is by him ſuffered to remain unlevelled, of profound wiſdom, liberal policy, comprehenſive ſyſtem; the true principle of Government and of a free Conſtitution; leaf after leaf, and period after period, have I turned them over; the author will ſhew in what part theſe great maxims are to be diſcovered; to mere mortal eyes, theſe publications ſeem to be a ſyſtem of political, moral and intellectual levelling; they ſeem to run a crazy race through all ages, with a native, genuine horror of any thing like genius, liberty, or the people; great generoſity of aſſertion, great thrift of argument, a turn to be offenſive, without a power to be ſevere, fury in the temper, and famine in the phraſe.

I find, and lament to find, in thoſe levelling publications, the following ſentiments: That Ireland is a Britiſh Colony,

Colony, and that to demand a free Conſtitution, was to ſeparate from Britain; that Ireland may prudently ſubmit to legiſlation without repreſentation; that Ireland had no Parliamentary Conſtitution till the time of James I.; that the creation of the dependency of the crown for ſupply on the Commons, was a pernicious precedent; that the remedy for our preſent free Conſtitution, and the only ſecurity for the connexion, was to put in the place of the Britiſh Parliament the commanding influence of the Britiſh Cabinet over the Iriſh Legiſlature. Couple this with a declaration, that half a million had been reſorted to ſome years back, to buy the Commons of Ireland: couple that with the declarations continued in this pamphlet, that for the laſt ſeven years, a noble Miniſter of the Crown had perſeveringly recommended the abolition of the Iriſh Parliament, and an Union in its place; couple all this together, and the reſult of the pamphlet will be the moſt complete and ample juſtification and panegyric of that oppoſition, who, for a courſe of years have, with honeſt perſeverance, reprobated that Miniſter's adminiſtration; I will not ſay it is a juſtification of rebellion, but it is the beſt defence I have ſeen; it amounts to a direct charge, for thoſe laſt 50 years, on the ariſtocracy, and on the commons, of faction, of plunder, of breaches with England, and of acts of ſeparation; and it particularly condemns the Parliament for thoſe very meaſures on which ſhe muſt reſt her credit and authority with the people; and further it charges, that before any rebel was in the country, a leading Miniſter in the cabinet, was, himſelf, and has been for 8 years, a ſecret adviſer againſt the Parliamentary Conſtitution of Ireland, of courſe againſt the fundamental laws of the land; to ſuch a work, containing three fabrications, four capital departures from matter of fact, together with the diſparagement of his country, and of almoſt every honeſt public character for the laſt 50 years, I don't think it neceſſary to ſay more.

I conclude

I conclude, therefore, by repeating what I have already ſolemnly declared—that

It is not fact, that we excited the Catholics.

It is not fact, that we perſecuted the Catholics..

It is not fact, that we adopted the Catholic meaſures after the place-bill and penſion bill had paſſed, and in queſt of new matter of oppoſition.

It is not fact, that I ever declared or wrote that the adjuſtment of 82 emanated from Dungannon.

It is not fact, that I ever compared the Parliament that accompliſhed that adjuſtment, to the Parliament of 1613.

It is not fact, that I ever declared that the Catholic would be moſt powerful, if theſe Nations were ſeparated.

It is not fact, that I ever abandoned to popularity the draft of a bill for veſting in the Parliament of England, a power of Imperial legiſlature.

It is not fact, that I ever ſaw, agreed to, or heard, of any ſuch draft.

It is not fact, that I ever agreed to an alliance with any Engliſh party, to oppoſe any plan of National concord.

It is not fact, that I ever entered into any alliance, offenſive and defenſive, with them, however I might eſteem their perſons, and prefer their principles.

Here

Here are twelve aſſertions made by the author—*he is publicly called upon to eſtabliſh them.*

I have ſaid thus much to defend my country and myſelf, in oppoſition to this publication, that takes the name of a Miniſter who has the ſupport of the Governments of both countries, and with reſpect to whom I have no advantage, except the cauſe, my own perſonal ſuperiority, and another advantage, which I poſſeſs in common with almoſt every honeſt ſubject in Ireland, and with the Iriſh nation herſelf, the advantage which the calumniated has over the calumniator. I might avail myſelf of many more vulnerable parts in thoſe publications, and preſs the ſuppoſed author perſonally, as he has preſſed others; but conſidering his ſituation more than he has done himſelf, I conſign him to judges more ſevere than I could be—and to him the moſt awful, and, on this ſide the grave, the moſt tremendous—HIS COUNTRY AND HIS CONSCIENCE!

APPENDIX.

EXTRACT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE (MR. *HUTCHINSON's*) *SPEECH, IN* 1793.

"BUT what was the hiſtory of the repreſentation in this country? He could inform gentlemen with ſome accuracy, having thought it his duty, when he took a more active part in public buſineſs, to extract from all the borough charters at the Rolls Office their material contents. The number of repreſentatives in the thirty-fourth year of Henry VIII. was one hundred; to this number Mary and Elizabeth added about forty-eight, but of theſe there were nineteen counties, of which Elizabeth had eſtabliſhed ſeventeen, a mode of repreſentation worthy the character of that great princeſs. In the firſt Parliament of James I. held in 1613, the members of the Houſe of Commons were 232; the laſt creation of a borough was by Queen Anne, who created one only. For the difference between the

the number of repreſentatives at the acceſſion of James, and the preſent number of 300, the Houſe of Stuart is reſponſible. One half of the repreſentatives were made by them, and made by the exertion of prerogative; of thoſe James made 40 at one ſtroke; moſt of them at the eve of a Parliament, and ſome after the writs of ſummons had iſſued. The Commons in that Parliament expreſſed their doubts whether thoſe boroughs had the power of returning members to ſit in Parliament, and reſerved that ſubject for future conſideration. Complaints were made to James of thoſe grants, but what was his anſwer? "I have made 40 boroughs; ſuppoſe I had made 400—the more the merrier." Charles I. followed the example of his father in exerciſing this prerogative, but not to ſo great an extent. Complaints were alſo made to him, and he gave aſſurances that the new corporations ſhould be reviewed by Parliament. The grants made by theſe two monarchs appear, by the hiſtories and correſpondences of thoſe times, to have been for the purpoſe of giving the Proteſtants a majority over the Roman Catholics. The grants by Charles II. James II. and Queen Anne, proceeded from motives of perſonal favour; thus it would appear, if the facts were inveſtigated, that one half of the repreſentation of Ireland had ariſen from the exertions of prerogative, influenced by occaſional motives, diſputes among religioniſts, and inducements of perſonal favour, but had not been derived from any of thoſe ſources which had produced the Engliſh Conſtitution. Had he the honour of being a member of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, he would never touch the venerable fabric of their repreſentation; but in this kingdom, the part of the repreſentation univerſally complained of, had originated in party or private motives, and he did not believe there was one preſcriptive borough in the whole kingdom. He believed ſome boroughs were called ſo, but he believed unjuſtly; eleven of the grants which had been mentioned, did not appear at the Rolls Office, but moſt of theſe were *modern* in the time of the *Houſe of Stuart.*"

FINIS.